



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/663,236

09/15/2003

Eric J. Larsen

SONYP029

3753

25920 7590 09/01/2009  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP  
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE  
SUITE 200  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

OMOTOSHO, EMMANUEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/663,236	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LARSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> EMMANUEL OMOTOSHO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-12,14-19,46-50 and 59-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-12,14-19,46-50 and 59-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/10/09</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

Applicant should note that the large number of references in the attached IDS have been considered by the examiner in the same manner as other documents in Office search files are considered by the examiner while conducting a search of the prior art in a proper field of search. **See MPEP 609.05(b)**. Applicant is requested to point out any particular references in the IDS which they believe may be of particular relevance to the instant claimed invention in response to this office action

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 6-19, 21, 46-50 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang US Patent 6,009,210 and further in view of Kanade et al. US Patent 6,151,009.

Art Unit: 3714

4. Kang teaches a method for processing interactive user control for a view of a scene displayed on a virtual window comprising:

5. In regards to claims 1,14-15,46,47,59,61

- a. Identifying a head of a user that is to interact with the scene (Col 1 lines 43-47 and Col 3 lines 29-32)
- b. Storing an initial frame of image data representing the head of the user (Col 3 lines 29-35)
- c. Tracking the identified head of the user during display of the scene, the tracking enabling detection of a change in location of the head of the user (Abstract)
- d. Tracking including identifying a search region within a frame of the user image data and comparing values within the search region to template values of the initial frame of the stored image data; adjusting a view frustum ('a view frustum' is being interpreted as the "view of the user into the virtual world") **in accordance with the change in location of the head of the user** (Col 2 lines 34-43 and Col 3 lines 4-21)
- e. Repeating the identifying the search region, the comparing, and adjusting for successive frames of the scene, wherein the comparing is performed with the initial frame of the stored image data (Col 2 lines 34-43 and Col 9 lines 17-44)
- f. A computing device and a display screen in communication with the computing device configured to display image data defined through a view-frustum (Fig 1)

Art Unit: 3714

- g. Tracking device is a camera (Fig 1)
  - h. a view frustum initially defined by a gaze projection set between outer edges of a virtual window when the location of the head is substantially normal to about a center point of the virtual window (Figs 1-3)
6. In regards to claim 16 adjusting the view-frustum moves the location of the head away from normal relative to the center point of the virtual window (Col 2 lines 34-43)
7. In regards to claim 17,59,61, location of the head being away from normal relative to the center point of the virtual window changes an angle of the gaze projection, the change in angle of the gaze projection displays a change in viewing angle of the scene provided by the video clip (Col 4 line 60- Col 5 line 49)
8. In regards to claim 60, the change in viewing angle of the scene is a result of the detected movement of the head of the user to enable the interaction with the scene (Col 4 line 60- Col 5 line 49)
9. In regards to claim 1,6-7,14,46,49,50 Kang fail to specifically teach
- i. Adjusting a scale of the scene according to a change in a distance of the head of the user from a capture device
  - j. Using a capture device having depth-capturing capability.
10. Kanade teaches the use of a depth capturing camera for interaction with a view of a scene (abstract)
11. One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, would have been motivated to have a system that interacts with a view of a scene using depth capturing

Art Unit: 3714

device to adjust a scale of the scene according to a change in a distance of the head of the user from the capture device. Using a depth camera, the system would be able to

- k. Obtain distance or depth information from the object being tracked (inherent of "depth camera")
- l. Determine any interaction such as occluding, shadowing, reflecting or colliding (Kanade abstract)
- m. Generate appropriate output based on said determination (Kanade abstract)

12. **Wherein the adjusted view frustum defined by an updated gaze projection of the changed location of the head through the outer edges of the virtual window** ((Col 2 lines 34-43 and Col 3 lines 4-21), examiner interprets this limitation as, 'as the user moves his/her head, the view frustum is changed to reflect said change'). **In regards to laterally adjusting the view frustum in a direction opposite to the change in location of the head of the user (see cols 3-4 of Kang), applicant should respectfully note that the location of the user's head and the location of the view frustum are opposite each other (i.e. the user is facing the view). Thus, they have different orientation (i.e. the user's left is the view frustum's right). Furthermore, the examiner interprets this limitation as ' as the user moves his/her head, the view frustum is changed to reflect the appropriate view perspective '. For example, if the user moves his/her head to the left, the vertex of rotational angle (i.e. the viewpoint around the viewing axis) will need to shift to the right (in respect of the user) to show the scene on the left of the user. Similar to if a**

Art Unit: 3714

**person wants to move his/her head to see what is on the left, the back of the person's head has to move to the right while the persons view moves to the right to see what is on the left.**

13. In regards to claim 8, the initial frame of image data is marker-less (Fig 1)

14. In regards to claim 9, the initial frame of data is maintained throughout the video clip (Fig 1)

15. In regards to claim 10,48, the video clip is of a video game. Although Kang teaches the method to be generally associated with virtual environment in computer systems, Kang further teaches that video games are well known in the art as virtual environment in a computer system (Col 1 lines 26-40)

16. In regards to claim 11, the interaction with the scene by tracking movement of the head of the user is independent of user hand-held controls for interacting with the video game (Col 1 lines 5-9)

17. In regards to claim 12, the method operation of tracking the identified head of the user during display of the video clip includes tracking a facial portion of the head and matching gray scale image data associated with the facial portion to image associated with a template of the facial portion (Col 9 lines 20-33)

18. In regards to claim 18-19,50, the method of adjusting a view frustum in accordance with the change in location of the head of the user includes identifying a point of interest of the scene of the video clip and modifying the view-frustum so that the point of interest appears at a constant location when displayed in successive video clips

Art Unit: 3714

(Kang Claim 6). The Examiner should point out that each frame in Kang's disclosure has to be scanned before the scene transformation could occur.

19. In regards to claim 21,49-50, the method operation of translating a view frustum in accordance with the change in location of the head of the user includes rotating the view-frustum about the head of a user according to the change in location of the head of the user (Kang Claim 5).

### ***Response to Arguments***

20. Applicant's arguments filed 11/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

21. On pages 11-12, applicant argues, "The first method taught is "to directly use the pose parameters to determine the absolute position and orientation of the viewpoint" (Col. 8, lines 27-29). In other words, movement of a user's head in a given direction produces movement of the view of the virtual reality environment in the same direction. The second method taught applies the same directional system, but incorporates incremental control to "indicate continuous movement within the virtual reality environment" (Col. 8, lines 32-40). In contrast to Kang, Applicants' claim 1 is directed towards a view of a scene comprising a view-frustum defined with reference to a gaze projection of a position of the head of the user through the outer edges of a virtual window. The volumetric virtual space beyond the virtual window which is delimited by the gaze projection through the outer edges defines the view-frustum. And as the user's head moves, the view-frustum is adjusted accordingly, such that the gaze projection through the virtual window is updated in light of the changed position of the user's head



Art Unit: 3714

to determine the new view-frustum. Thus, in contrast to the direct use of pose parameters to determine viewpoint disclosed by Kang, Applicants' claim 1 utilizes an indirect method wherein the view of the scene is defined with reference to a virtual window. Hence, a movement of a user's head in a lateral direction will have the perceptual effect of shifting the view of the scene in the opposite direction. Kang does not disclose a view-frustum defined with reference to a virtual window, nor the adjustment of such a view-frustum in the manner claimed."

22. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In Kang's invention, the player is looking at the virtual reality through an angled view (i.e. the angle about the viewing axis). As the player's head changes in position, the vertex of said angle will need to move in an opposite direction in order to move the scene in the same direction that the head is moving. This is not different from applicants claimed invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

23. In view of the explanation shown on page 9 of applicant's arguments and remarks dated 8/4/09, the rejection under second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is now withdrawn.

24. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

25. On pages 10-11, applicant argues, "in regard to "the problem of using [the tracked movements] to control the viewing of the virtual reality environment" (Col. 8, lines 26-27), Kang discloses only two methods. The first method taught is "to directly use the pose parameters to determine the absolute position and orientation of the

Art Unit: 3714

viewpoint" (Col. 8, lines 27-29). In other words, a viewpoint set within the virtual reality environment is moved in the same manner as is detected in the user's face. Thus, movement of the user's head to the left causes movement of the viewpoint to the left; rotation of the user's head in a clockwise direction causes rotation of the viewpoint in a clockwise direction, etc."

26. This is not accurate. Kang's discussion on directly using the pose parameters to determine the absolute position and orientation of the viewpoint is better understood in view of the camera model that Kang uses. Kang uses a perspective based camera model (see col 1, 3 and 5). This is contrary to the interpretation the applicant is trying to impose on Kang's invention. The viewpoint moves according to how the camera would perceive the scene in the direction of the change in the user's head movement. To accurately determine the absolute position and orientation of the said perspective of the viewpoint, the video will move in the opposite direction so that the user sees what the camera would see if it panned the scene in the direction that the user is turning his/her head (for example, see Wang US. Patent U.S. 5,742,263 col 1:15-22 which discusses the perspective change of a viewpoint in view of the movement of a user's head being tracked by a camera in a virtual reality application).

27. On page 14, applicant argues, "the Examiner's characterization of various entities as having particular orientations and therefore certain left and right sides is arbitrary and subjective. The terms "left" and "right" make sense when used to describe direction in relation to a user who faces a particular direction (as used above), but are confusing as applied to other entities, such as the view frustum. Moreover, Applicants'

Art Unit: 3714

claimed subject matter is not defined in terms of left and right, but in terms of direction.

Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to clarify how the prior art teaches

Applicants' claimed subject matter relating to directionality. IV. Independent claims 14, 46, 59 (new), and the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

28. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Since the view frustum has to change in view of the change in the location of the head, the left and right example makes perfect sense when applied to entities such as the view frustum. A change in location is broad enough to also incorporate a change in direction.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EMMANUEL OMOTOSHO whose telephone number is (571)272-3106. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EO

/Ronald Laneau/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714  
08/28/09